

REMARKS

Claims 4-6, 14 and 18 remain pending in this application. Claims 4-6, 14 and 18 have been amended. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims in the present and in other applications. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following.

Claim 14 stands objected to due to informalities. The claim has been amended to address the concerns raised by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 has been amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083131 to Machida. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite “installing said installation program and said print setting information into said computer.” The Machida reference does not disclose or suggest acquiring print setting information inherent to a computer from an external database, producing an installation program based on the acquired print setting information, and then installing the installation program into the computer. Accordingly, claim 4 should be allowable over Machida.

Claims 5-6, 14 and 18 have been amended to recite similar limitations and should be found to be allowable over Machida as well for at least the reasons provided above as well as on their own merits.

Furthermore, claim 4 recites the step of “acquiring a template of a scenario, the scenario being a file describing procedures for installing the software.” Thus, according to claim 4, the scenario is a file describing installation procedure. A device driver of the type mentioned in Machida does not describe any installation procedure. Since Machida does not meet the scenario of claim 4, the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

The Office Action maintains that the not-yet-updated driver of Machida teaches the template of the present invention, and that the updated driver teaches the scenario. Generally, drivers, as explained in, for example, the Linux manual “control the interaction between the operating system and the hardware device that they are controlling.” A device driver is not an installation procedure file, it is instead a control or correspondence file. Machida mentions that a device driver is “for driving peripheral devices,” (Machida ¶0004) which is in accord with the industry standard definition. A device driver does not “describe procedures for installing software,” nor does Machida at any point describe a driver as including an installation procedure.

As Machida does not disclose acquiring print setting information inherent to a computer from an external database, producing an installation program based on the acquired print setting information, and then installing the installation program into the computer, and furthermore does not disclose “acquiring a template of a scenario, the scenario being a file describing procedures for installing the software,” claim 4 should be allowable over Machida. All of claims 5-6, 14 and 18 recite similar limitations to those described above and are allowable over Machida for at least the reasons provided above as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Anthony M. Briggs, Jr.

Registration No.: 52,654

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant